

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-23 remain pending in this application.

The following remarks supplement the arguments presented in a reply filed April 26, 2010, which are incorporated herein by reference. The undersigned contacted Examiner McCulley to schedule an interview, but was informed that August 11 was her last day in the Office before going on maternity leave. Subsequent telephone contacts with Supervisor Mark Eashoo indicated that the application would be reassigned to a new examiner, and that an interview could be scheduled after filing these supplemental remarks with a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, the new examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned after considering this paper to schedule an interview.

Examiner McCulley considered the arguments presented in the April 26, 2010, Reply, but was not persuaded of patentability because Kihara et al. allegedly teaches that the epoxy compound used to make the curing agent has a chlorine content of less than 500 ppm (col. 2, lines 55-62) which overlaps the claimed range. Applicants believe the Examiner has misinterpreted the teachings of Kihara et al.

The disclosure at col. 2, lines 55-62 is part of a more complete disclosure at col. 2, lines 45-61 - compare with the disclosure at col. 3, lines 31-48. It should be apparent that Kihara et al. does not suggest a hydrophobic epoxy compound having a total chlorine content of 500 ppm or less, but is teaching that an epoxy resin curing agent having a total chlorine content of 500 ppm or below can be formed from a reaction product between (a) modified polyamine formed from a reaction product of a polyamine and chlorohydrin, and having a total chlorine content of 1000 ppm or below, AND at least

one kind of (b) hydrophobic epoxy compound having at least one epoxy group in the molecule - there is no explicit disclosure of any chlorine content of the hydrophobic epoxy compound reactant.

Kihara et al. fails to teach or suggest that the total amount of chlorines in the hydrophobic epoxy compound is not more than 400 ppm. Indeed, any hydrophobic epoxy compound disclosed in the examples of Kihara et al. fail to teach or suggest that they include chlorine. The amount of chlorine disclosed in Preparation Example 1 of Kihara et al. (col. 8, line 55 et seq.) is the total amount of chlorine of the chlorohydrin contained in the modified polyamine and not the hydrophobic epoxy compound. In Example 1 of Kihara et al., Epicoat 828 and Epiol B are used as the hydrophobic epoxy compound, but there is no suggestion that these products contain chlorine. The chlorohydrin contained in the modified polyamine cannot react with any hydrophobic epoxy compound because the chlorohydrin does not have a reaction point, and remains in the aqueous epoxy resin curing agent as an unreacted material.

The total chlorine content disclosed at col. 3, lines 55-62 of Kihara et al. describes not the chlorine content of the hydrophobic epoxy compound, but indicates the amount of chlorine provided by the chlorohydrin which remains in "the aqueous epoxy resin curing agent prepared by the reaction of the modified polyamine with the hydrophobic epoxy compound." In other words, the "less than 500 ppm chlorine" disclosure modifies the content of the epoxy resin curing agent reaction product, not the content of the hydrophobic epoxy compound reactant. See col. 3, lines 31-48. Kihara et al. contains no teaching, suggestion or reason to observe the claimed feature of using an epoxy resin

in which the total amount of chlorines in the epoxy resin is not more than 400 ppm.

Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Prompt and favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 25, 2010

By: Charles E. Van Horn
Charles E. Van Horn
Reg. No. 40,266
(202) 408-4000